

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, applicant has amended claims 1 and 6, and added new claim 24 without adding any new matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in a condition for allowance in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdoh (U.S. 6,564,207) in view of Peters *et al.* (U.S. 5,893,098). Claims 3, 6, and 12 were rejected as above in further view of Gisby (U.S. 5,943,416), whereas claims 13-21 were rejected in still further view of Mitchell *et al.* (U.S. 5,164,981). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a system of collecting survey information comprising:

an interactive voice recognition unit for providing
said questions to the survey participant in a
verbal manner, wherein

said interactive voice recognition unit also receives
the responses to said questions in a verbal
manner...wherein

said system includes a voice recorder for digitally
recording said verbatim answer given by the
survey participant for audio playback to the
user.

(emphasis added). This limitation is similar to the limitation that was in dependent claim 3 (currently canceled), which the Examiner rejected in light of Gisby, citing column 4, lines 4-67. However, nowhere in this reference is it discussed that verbal answers of a survey participant are digitally recorded for playback to a user. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the reference. Claim 15 recites similar limitations, and thus is patentable for similar reasons.

Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, recites that the “verbatim question” is provided to the survey participant “when a response to a previous question meets a specified criterion but no verbatim question is provided if the response does not meet the specified criterion”. Claim 15 recites similar limitations. None of the references suggest providing a verbatim question in this manner, and thus claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the references for these reasons as well.

Claim 6, as amended, recites a method of collecting and managing survey data comprising the step of “initiating a process of establishing communication with a survey participant, wherein said survey participant is randomly selected from a pool of potential participants who had been provided a product or service within 72 hours of said initiating” and the step of “automatically compiling and presenting a survey report to a user within 24 hours of said initiating, said survey report utilizing the answers collected from said survey participant for said report”. New claim 24 recites similar limitations. None of the references disclose such a method, and thus claims 6 and 24 are patentable over the references for at least this reason.

The remaining claims depend on one of the above discussed claims, and thus are patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as their parent claim.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the

examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. QUAL 32668.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: / Robert F. Bodi /
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

April 25, 2008